



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PUBLIC HEALTH REPORTS

VOL. 31

JUNE 9, 1916

No. 23

SUPREME COURT CONSTRUES ANTINARCOTIC LAW.

DECIDES THAT THE HARRISON ANTINARCOTIC LAW DOES NOT PROHIBIT PERSONS WHO ARE NOT REQUIRED TO REGISTER FROM HAVING POSSESSION OF HABIT-FORMING DRUGS.

The United States Supreme Court, on June 5, 1916, affirmed the decision of the United States District Court in *United States v. Jin Fuey Moy* (PUBLIC HEALTH REPORTS Jan. 21, 1916, p. 143).

The court decided that the words "any person not registered" as used in section 8 of the law "can not be taken to mean any person in the United States, but must be taken to refer to the class with which the statute undertakes to deal—the persons who are required to register by section 1."

Under this decision, a person who does not import, produce, manufacture, deal in, dispense, sell, or distribute the drugs can not be convicted of violating the Harrison law merely because he has possession of some of the drugs.

SUPPLEMENTING STATE LAW BY CITY ORDINANCE.

KANSAS COURT DECIDES THAT A CITY MAY PROVIDE OTHER AND ADDITIONAL RULES AND IMPOSE MORE SEVERE PENALTIES THAN ARE PROVIDED BY STATE LAWS ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

Has a city the power to make more strict regulations and to impose more severe penalties than are provided by the State laws or regulations on the same subject?

This is a question which has been differently decided by the courts of different States, but the Supreme Court of Kansas has decided that in Kansas the question must be answered in the affirmative. (See p. 1499 of this issue of the PUBLIC HEALTH REPORTS.) The court said that "a city may not by ordinance authorize that which a statute prohibits nor punish the doing of an act which the statute expressly authorizes"; but "an ordinance enacted in the exercise of the police power is not necessarily inconsistent with a State law on the same subject because the city provides for greater restrictions or makes higher standards than are provided or made by the statute." The court recognized the fact that "it may be necessary to make additional requirements and stricter regulations and to impose more severe penalties in a congested district like a city than are made and enforced in a rural district."